



RE: FW: comments on RR docs: RADs for Spur Lines and WY/HM, PMPs, RAWP

Wurtzler, Gail to: Clifford Villa, Trueblood, Craig

08/11/2009 11:43 AM

Cc: "Lawrence, Robert"

Cliff - I am available at 12:00 your time. Bob is not. However, I can tell you that both Bob and I share Craig's concerns. Gail

-----Original Message-----

From: Villa.Clifford@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Villa.Clifford@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2009 12:32 PM
To: Trueblood, Craig
Cc: Sheppard, Bruce A; Wurtzler, Gail; Lawrence, Robert
Subject: Re: FW: comments on RR docs: RADs for Spur Lines and WY/HM, PMPs, RAWP

Craig: Got your voicemail. Can you call me at 12:00 noon our time?

I've got to run to another meeting at 12:30 but would like to talk with you and UP attys before then if possible.

Thanks.

Cliff Villa
Assistant Regional Counsel
U.S. EPA Region 10

To "Trueblood, Craig" <craig.trueblood@klgates.com> Clifford Villa/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

cc 08/11/2009 11:28 AM "Wurtzler, Gail" <Gail.Wurtzler@dgsllaw.com>, "Lawrence, Robert" <Robert.Lawrence@dgsllaw.com>, "Sheppard, Bruce A" <Bruce.Sheppard@bnsf.com>

Subject FW: comments on RR docs: RADs for Spur Lines and

WY/HM, PMPs, RAWP

Confidential - For Settlement Purposes

Cliff,

I left v-mail this morning but have not heard back from you yet. Given the urgency of this matter I am sending a short e-mail summarizing BNSF's concerns.

1) Level of detail. Ed is asking for a level of detail that BNSF was not prepared to provide as part of the CD. Many of his requests are of a scale appropriate for plans and specs, which are not yet being prepared. Here are two examples:

EPA has requested that we provide traffic control, site use, and work sequencing plans as part of this submittal. These plans are typically prepared by the remediation contractor based on their proposed approach to the work.

Grading plan - the EPA is requesting a grading plan for the full Wallace Yard site. The plans and drawings currently specify that positive drainage must be maintained, but don't specify exact grades that the contractor must meet, allowing for field engineering of the barrier as appropriate.

2) Work beyond the EE/CA. In several instances, Ed is asking that the RAD Drawings specify work that is not required by the EE/CA or Action memo. Here are examples:

The EPA is requesting addition of a note on the drawings indicating that we will not be damaging or removing any of the vegetation on the more heavily vegetated areas to the north of I-90. We are not planning to make significant efforts to save that vegetation

because the anticipated future use of the property is commercial or industrial.

The EPA has reiterated that they believe fencing is required along the up-slope site of the former foundation area at the Hercules Mill site, which is not required by the EE/CA.

Streambank regrading/rip-rap comments - we will tie the barrier into existing materials at the edge of the streambank and repair any damage that occurs to the streambank, but permanent erosion controls along the streambank are not part of the scope of the response action.

At end of Ninemile Creek, beyond MM 3.75, the EE/CA called for no further action except road shoulder remediation if within 1000 ft. of residence. Now EPA is asking for a gravel barrier over much of this area.

3) Work not consistent with CD. In a couple instances, Ed is requesting changes in the RAD Drawings that are not consistent with the provisions of the CD we negotiated. First, he is asking that RUAs along the former Spur Lines be noted on the RAD Drawings but these are areas where DEQ will be doing work, not BNSF and UPRR. Second, Ed is indicating that contaminated material within the RoW cannot be graded or used to cut and fill within the former RoW, prior to capping, in order to achieve property grades and drainage.

4) Functional RoW Width. Ed is asking that the entire former RoW width be expressly included for remediation in all the RAD Drawings. This will increase the scope of work, and the cost, well beyond what is anticipated in the EE/CA and what was authorized by BNSF for purposes of this settlement. When we resolved the monetary issues in the CD the last couple weeks I was under the impression that the FROWW concept was acceptable to EPA provided the railroads showed some flexibility in that regard in the residential areas that DEQ was going to remediate under the BPRP (and for which EPA would be seeking cost

reimbursement). Now
that the agency has what it wanted on the monetary
provisions, are we
now being asked to abandon that part of the
understanding?

Please give me a call to discuss.

Craig T.

From: Moreen.Ed@epamail.epa.gov [
mailto:Moreen.Ed@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Sunday, August 09, 2009 10:35 PM
To: Handy, Sara
Cc: Villa.Clifford@epamail.epa.gov;
Nicholas.Zilka@deq.idaho.gov;
Chung.Angela@epamail.epa.gov;
Grandinetti.Cami@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: comments on RR docs: RADs for Spur Lines and
WY/HM, PMPs, RAWP

Hi Sara:

I have a number of comments and must convey to you
that the revised RADs
and documents while attempting to address some of our
comments and
discussions fall short of being in final form.
Please recognize that
our comments on the 4 referenced documents are
intended to be of a
representative nature and should be taken as
illustrative of the types
of issues that we found. The comments should be
taken as indicative of
the types of issues and errors that have been
identified, but it is
incumbent upon you to make the comprehensive changes
necessary to
finalize these documents. In the interest of
getting these completed
in the most expedient nature please produce the
documents in a final,
biddable, and constructible form. That will serve
everyone's interest
and get us to the endpoint as quickly as possible.
We have worked very
quickly to provide these comments in the interest of
getting these
documents completed as soon as possible. We are
willing to make
substantial efforts to work with you so that the
revisions can be
carried out as quickly as possible. That being said,
we have many
demands on our schedules, and the more communicative
you can be as to
your plans and turn around times the better the
government team will be
able to respond. As you know, when we met in Coeur

d'Alene in May we
had requested a schedule for deliverables so that we
could plan our time
accordingly. The production and distribution of such
a plan would have
been very helpful and would have helped us to plan
our reviews better.
A simplified form of such a schedule would be very
helpful for what I
hope is the final submission of these documents.
However, given the
apparent lack of site detail and project
specifications, it will require
a great deal of work on your firms part to get these
into a final,
acceptable form.

Myself and others would be glad to get on the phone
to discuss these in
more detail.

Ed Moreen
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Coeur d'Alene Field Office
1910 Northwest Blvd, Suite 208
Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814
ph. 208.664.4588
fax 208.664.5829
<http://www.epa.gov/r10earth/bh.htm>

NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it
are the property
of ARCADIS U.S., Inc. and its affiliates. All rights,
including without
limitation copyright, are reserved. The proprietary
information
contained in this e-mail message, and any files
transmitted with it, is
intended for the use of the recipient(s) named above.
If the reader of
this e-mail is not the intended recipient, you are
hereby notified that
you have received this e-mail in error and that any
review, distribution
or copying of this e-mail or any files transmitted
with it is strictly
prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in
error, please notify the
sender immediately and delete the original message
and any files
transmitted. The unauthorized use of this e-mail or
any files
transmitted with it is prohibited and disclaimed by
ARCADIS U.S., Inc.
and its affiliates. Nothing herein is intended to

constitute the
offering or performance of services where otherwise
restricted by law.

This electronic message contains information from the
law firm of K&L

Gates LLP. The contents may be privileged and
confidential and are
intended for the use of the intended addressee(s)
only. If you are not
an intended addressee, note that any disclosure,
copying, distribution,
or use of the contents of this message is prohibited.
If you have
received this e-mail in error, please contact me at
craig.trueblood@klgates.com.

(See attached file: EPA comments on RR Deliverables
for Wallace Yard
and Spur Lines.doc)